

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action ("OA")<sup>1</sup> mailed March 6, 2006, the Examiner objected to the title of the invention, rejected claims 3, 4, 6, 9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, and rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,041,413 to Wang ("Wang"). Applicants hereby amend claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 11. Support for the amendment of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 11 can be found throughout the Drawings and the Specification at, for example, Figure 1 and 2, and on page 7, line 25 to page 8, line 15 and page 9, lines 1-19. Claims 1-16 remain pending. In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

**Objections**

As noted above, the Examiner objected to the title of the invention. Applicants have amended the title of this application to --APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR INHIBITING ACTIVATION OF AN ELECTRONIC DEVICE--, which is more descriptive. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the title be withdrawn.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

**§ 112, second paragraph Rejections**

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 6, 9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 3, 4, 6, 9, and 11 to ensure proper antecedent basis is provided and thereby overcome the Examiner's § 112, second paragraph rejection. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 3, 4, 6, 9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

**§ 102(b) Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Wang. In order to properly anticipate Applicants' claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of the claim in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in...the claim." See M.P.E.P. § 2131 (8<sup>th</sup> Ed., Aug. 2001), quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Finally, "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." M.P.E.P. § 2131 (8<sup>th</sup> ed., 2001), p. 2100-69.

Applicants respectfully submit that Wang does not disclose each and every element of amended claim 1. For example, among other things, the reference does not disclose or suggest: "means for holding information representing whether activation of the electronic device is inhibited by the inhibiting means; and means for executing activation or activation inhibition of the electronic device on the basis of the information

stored in the holding means when an activation instruction is generated in the electronic device,” as recited in amended claim 1. Applicants respectfully note that independent claim 1 recites means-plus-function limitations in accordance to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6, and is thus construed to cover the corresponding structure disclosed in the specification and equivalents.

Wang discloses a power-on security control apparatus for a computer supply subsystem for shielding against unauthorized access to computer systems (Wang, abstract). In Wang, when a user wishes to power-on a computer system, the computer system monitors the user’s keystrokes over an external keyboard (Wang, col. 5, lines 1-14). If the user’s keystrokes coincide with a pre-stored password, the computer system is powered on (Wang, col. 5, lines 14-18). Therefore, Wang appears to teach that the pre-stored password is used to perform a password authentication process. However, the pre-stored password in Wang does not represent whether or not activation of the computer system is inhibited. For example, in Wang, when the password authentication process results in success, the computer system is automatically activated (Wang, col. 5, lines 14-18). In contrast, the electronic device recited in claim 1 does not activate the electronic device when an information stored in means for holding information indicates that the activation of the electronic device is inhibited, even if the electronic device successfully passes a password authentication process. Accordingly, Wang does not teach or suggest, at least, “means for holding information representing whether activation of the electronic device is inhibited by the inhibiting means; and means for executing activation or activation inhibition of the electronic device on the basis of the information stored in the holding means when an

activation instruction is generated in the electronic device," as recited in amended claim 1.

Since Wang does not disclose each and every element of claim 1, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Wang. Because claims 7, 12, 13, and 16, although of different scope, are independent claims with limitations similar to those of claim 1, Applicants further submit that claims 7, 12, 13, and 16 are also not anticipated by Wang for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 1. Dependent claims 2-6, 8-11, 14 and 15 are allowable at least due to their dependence from an allowable base claims 1, 7, and 13. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.


Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 6, 2006

By:



Joshua C. Liu  
Reg. No. 55,391